13th September 1958]

there is a battle of wits. It is time for us to elicit more information from the Government. Please be considerate to us by extending the question time.

Mr. SPEAKER : The hon. Member unnecessarily took a very long time to make no point (laughter) for this reason that generosity does not lie with the Speaker in this case. It lies with the hon. Members of the House. According to the Rules only one hour must be set apart for the questions. If the House wants to take more time, it is open to the hon. Members to say they will like to have more time set apart for questions. Then I have no objection to extend the question hour. But I should like to say that the power does not lie with the Speaker. Therefore the appeal should go to the House and not to the Speaker. In this case since the House has agreed to sit for ten more minutes, the question does not arise.

Sri D. S. AUTHIMOOLAM : ' On principles of natural justice ' கொஞ்சம் அதிக நேரம் கொடுத்தால் எல்லோருக்கும் கேள்வி கேட்பதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் கிடைக்கும்.

Mr. SPEAKER : முக்கியமான கேள்வியாக இருந்தால் ஆறு உப கேள்விகளை அனுமதிக்கிறேன். ஜில்லாவைப்பற்றிய விஷயமாக இருந்தால் இரண்டு உப கேள்விகளை அனுமதிக்கிறேன். முக்கியமில்லை என்றால் அடுத்த கேள்விக்குப் போகிறேன்.

Sri P. S. K. LAKSHIPATHI RAJ : கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, ஒரு வேண்டுகோள். கேள்வி நேரத்தை சற்று அதிகப்படுத்தவேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன். எங்களுடைய சந்தேகங்களுக்கு எல்லாம் அரசாங்கத்தினிடம் விளக்கம் கேட்டுத் தெரிந்துகொள்வதற்கு இதுதான் ஏற்ற சந்தர்ப்பமாகையால், கேள்வி நேரத்தை அதிகப்படுத்த வேண்டுமென்று கேட்டுக்கொள்கிறேன்.

Mr. SPEAKER : கேள்வி நேரத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துவது அங்கத்தினர்கள் கையில் தானிருக்கிறது. The hon. Member forgets that he has not given any question but if some hon. Member gives the question, he wants to put supplementary questions on it. Even in the Parliament only the Member who gives notice of the question has priority in asking supplementary questions but not the member who does not take care to give notice of any questions.

Magnesite.

* 228-B *Q.*—Sri T. S. RAMASWAMY PILLAI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the application for transfer of the leasehold rights for Magnesite in certain areas in Omalur and Salem taluks of Madras State to Messrs. Burn and Co., Ltd., of Calcutta, by Messrs. Magnesite Syndicate, Limited, was rejected by the Government;

(*b*) if so, the reasons therefor and the date of rejection;

(*c*) Whether any appeal against the rejection was preferred by the said concern before the Central Government;

[13th September 1958

(*d*) whether the Madras Government had any information regarding the fate of this appeal;

(*e*) whether subsequently, Messrs. Magnesite Syndicate, Limited, were allowed to transfer its area to Messrs. Burn and Co., Ltd., for a consideration of one lakh Sterling to the Magnesite Syndicate, Limited, by Messrs. Burn and Co.;

(*f*) the reasons that weighed with the Government to change their original attitude;

(*g*) whether any other industrialist or industrial concerns applied for the lease of the said lands for the manufacture of refractories;

(*h*) if so, the names of the persons or concerns and under what conditions;

(*i*) the revenue of the Government from these areas by way of lease amount and royalty; and

(*j*) the rates of these?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN : (*a*) Yes, Sir.

(*b*) The orders were issued on 28th March 1957. The reason was that the Government of India had a proposal to set up a refractories plant and that the magnesite deposits of Salem would be required for that plant. Subsequently, the Government of India stated that their requirements could be met even if this lease was transferred to Burn and Co., and requested this Government to grant permission for the transfer. This Government, however, did not agree to the transfer as they wanted to explore the possibilities of working the mines as a State enterprise.

(*c*) Yes, Sir.

(*d*) Yes, Sir. The Central Government rejected the appeal as being outside their jurisdiction.

(*e*) In May 1958, the Government permitted the Magnesite Syndicate, Limited, to transfer the lease to Burn and Co. The consideration of one lakh of pounds Sterling was not for the transfer of the lease but for the plant, machinery, lands, buildings, contents of buildings, stores, stocks of magnesite on the spot and share capital of the Indian Company.

(*f*) The reasons that prompted the Government to agree to the transfer of the lease are as follows :—

(i) Government's endeavour to form a Corporation consisting of the Central Government, State Government and Burn and Company for purpose of exploiting the magnesite mines and establishing a refractory plant failed.

(ii) The Government of Madras did not have either the capital required which was estimated to be a crore of rupees nor the technical know how for establishing a refractory plant.

13th September 1958]

(iii) The profit that would accrue to the State by merely exploiting the mines only without a refractory plant and estimated to be Rs. 3 lakhs annually on an investment of Rs. 22 lakhs. On the other hand, the establishment of a refractory plant would bring about an investment of about Rs. 70 lakhs in the Industry, afford additional employment for over thousand persons and encourage the development of a large number of ancillary industries.

(iv) Messrs. Burn and Company gave an assurance that they would set up a refractory plant at Salem? if the lease was transferred to them.

Hence the transfer was permitted. Thus there is no change in the Government's attitude.

(*g*) & (*h*) No industrialist who held a licence for the setting up of a refractory plant applied for the lease. The only party which had a licence for setting up a refractory plant at Salem was Burn and Company. Messrs. Tiffin Barytes, Asbestos and Paints, Ltd., applied in December 1956 for a lease of a portion of the area held by Magnesite, Syndicate, Limited, but the application was rejected, as the area had not yet become available for re-grant. Sri P. N. Balasubramaniam also has since applied for a portion of the area, but the application was received only on the 29th July 1958. Messrs. Tiffin Barytes wanted the Magnesite Syndicate's lease to be treated as void as it was alleged that the area covered by the lease and the period within which the lease was executed were not in accordance with the prescribed rules. Sri P. N. Balasubramaniam also has advanced the same arguments. These objections were considered by the Government before the application of Tiffin Barytes was rejected.

(*i*) Figures are readily available for the years 1953–1957 only.

Year.	Royalty realised.
1953	Rs. 19,376·34 nP. (rupees nineteen thousand three hundred and seventy six and naye Paise thirty-four only.
1954	Rs. 40,570·44 nP. (rupees forty thousand five hundred and seventy and naye Paise forty-four only).
1955	Rs. 31,589·66 nP. (rupees thirty-one thousand five hundred and eighty-nine and naye Paise sixty six-only).
1956	Rs. 30,842·42 nP. (rupees thirty thousand eight hundred and forty-two and naye Paise forty-two only.
1957	Rs. 43,227·36 nP. (rupees forty-three thousand two hundred and twenty-seven and naye Paise thirty-six only.)

[13th September 1958

(*j*) ***Royalty.***—2½ per cent of the sale value at pit's mouth.

Dead rent—Re. 1 per acre per annum.

Surface rent—Re. 1 per acre per annum.

The question of enhancing these rates to conform to the rates prescribed in the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957, is under consideration.

SRI T. S. RAMASWAMY PILLAI: May I know whether the Government have gone into the production cost of magnesite briquettes?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Yes, Sir. With our own experts, it is estimated that the price of a magnesite briquette, that would fetch in the market, is Rs. 642.

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY: பர்ன் அண்டு கம்பெனிக்கு இந்தக் குத்தகையை மாற்றியதினால் ஆட்சியாளர்களைப்பற்றி ஒரு தவறான எண்ணம் பரவி வருவது கனம் அமைச்சர் அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியுமா? இது சம்பந்தமாக "மந்திரி பதிலளிப்பாரா" என்ற ஒரு புத்தகத்தை அச்சிட்டு வெளியிட்டிருப்பது சர்க்காருக்குத் தெரியுமா?

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: அதற்காகத்தான், கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்தக் கேள்வியின் மீது பத்து நிமிஷங்களுக்கோ அல்லது இருபது நிமிஷங்களுக்கோ உப கேள்விகளை அனுமதிக்கும்படி கேட்டுக் கொள்கிறேன். ஏனென்றால், யாராரிடத்தில் அச்சுக்கூடங்கள் இருக்கின்றனவோ, அவர்கள் எல்லாம் வாய்க்கு வந்தபடி எல்லாம் எழுதி பிரசுரிப்பதனால் சர்க்காருக்கு கஷ்டம் ஏற்படுகிறது. சட்டசபையில்தான் இதை எல்லாம் விளக்க முடியும்.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Hon. Minister wants more time to be allowed for this question, I have no objection to allow a half-hour debate on it.

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY: Sir, the Hon. Minister has not answered my question.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM: Sir, I request that a half-hour debate be allowed on this subject.

SRI M. KALYANASUNDARAM: Sir, we will have the half-hour debate after to-day's agenda is disposed of.

THE HON. SRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I agree to the half-hour debate.

MR. SPEAKER: I have no objection. We will have the half-hour debate after to-day's business is over.

Cottage and Small Scale Industries

* 228-C *Q.*—SRI K. RAMACHANDRAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Industries be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of Cottage and Small Scale Industries started taluk-war in the Ramanathapuram district during the First Five-Year Plan period with details of location and the number of persons employed therein; and